

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADIL HIRAMANNEK, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

L. MICHAEL CLARK, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-00228-RMW

FURTHER SCHEDULING ORDER

Re: Dkt. Nos. 549, 550

Defendants Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara and Beth Miller move to extend the deadline to conduct a settlement conference with plaintiffs before Magistrate Judge Grewal. Dkt. No. 550. Plaintiffs Roda and Adil HirananeK oppose and request that this court hold a case management conference on February 25, 2016. Dkt. Nos. 549, 551.

This court's previous scheduling order set a deadline of March 3, 2016 to conduct the settlement conference, Dkt. No. 201, and a settlement conference is set for February 29, 2016, Dkt. No. 509. Given the parties' apparent difficulty in agreeing upon a settlement conference date, the court finds that moving forward with the conference as scheduled on February 29, 2016 may be the most efficient way to attempt to resolve their disputes. If the parties are unable to achieve a negotiated settlement on February 29, a further settlement conference may be scheduled at least 10 days before the (yet to be rescheduled) trial date in this case if Judge Grewal believes it would be

1 productive.

2 The court is unavailable for a case management conference on February 25, 2016 due to an
3 ongoing trial, and no proceedings in this case will take place on that date. The court appreciates
4 plaintiffs' desire to achieve a speedy resolution of their claims, but plaintiffs need to understand
5 that this court has limited resources to dedicate to any given case, including theirs. If the parties
6 are unable to resolve their dispute at the February 29, 2016 settlement conference, the court will
7 determine an appropriate schedule for the pretrial conference and trial in this matter after receiving
8 the parties' submissions regarding plaintiffs' remaining Americans with Disabilities Act
9 allegations. *See* Dkt. No. 546 at 20. Any remaining issues requiring court attention can be
10 addressed in an amended joint pretrial statement in advance of the pretrial conference.

11 This order does not address Mr. Hiranek's claims against defendants McChristian, Plett,
12 and Polumbus. A separate order will address those claims.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: February 23, 2016



15 Ronald M. Whyte
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27